

Application No. 10/781,183
Attorney Docket No. 14335US02

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-42. Claims 10, 13, 34, 36, and 37 were objected to by the Examiner. Claims 1-42 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 2, 10, 13, 20, and 34-42 have been canceled and claims 1, and 19 have been amended.

Claims 10, 13, 34, 36, and 37 were objected to as informal. However, claims 10, 13, 34, 36, and 37 have been canceled. Consequently, the objection is respectfully submitted to be moot.

Claims 1, 8, 19, 25, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,911,493.

Claims 1, 7-8, 12-13, 19, 24-25, 29, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wheaton, U.S. Patent No. 6,209,147.

Claims 19, 25-26, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gladsden, U.S. Patent No. 3,215,831.

Claims 34, 36, and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by DeGutis, U.S. Patent No. 6,402,547.

Claims 2-4, 20-21, 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. '493 or Wheaton '147, or Gladsden et al. '831, as applied to claims 1, 19, and/or 34 above, and further in view of Zamarin et al. (EP 851,178).

Application No. 10/781,183
Attorney Docket No. 14335US02

Claims 5-6, 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. '493 or Wheaton '147, or Gladsden et al. '831 in view of Zamarin et al. (EP Patent No. 851,178) as applied to claims 1-3, 19-20 above, and further in view of Kildow (US Patent No. 6,070,808).

Claims 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeGutis et al. '547 as applied to claims 34 and 38 above, and further in view of Kildow (US Patent No. 6,070,808).

Claims 7 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. '493 or Gladsden et al. '831 as applied to claim 1 and/or claim 19 above, and further in view of Zamarin et al. (EP 851,178).

Claims 9, 26, 35 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheaton '147 or DeGutis et al. '547 as applied to claims 1, 19, 34, and 38 above, and further in view of Gladsden et al. (US Patent No. 3,215,831).

Claims 10 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheaton '147 or DeGutis et al. '547 in view of Zamarin et al. (EP Patent No. 851,178) applied to claims 1-2, 19-20 above, and further in view of Gladsden et al. (US Patent No. 3,215,831).

Claims 11, 14-18, 28-33, 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheaton '147 or Gladsden et al. '831 as applied to claims 1, 12, 19, and 34 above, and further in view of Woolford '559.

Application No. 10/781,183
Attorney Docket No. 14335US02

The present application includes independent claims 1, 19, and 34. Independent claim 34 and its respective dependent claims have been canceled.

With regard to claim 1, the only rejections remaining to independent claim 1 are 102 rejections in light of Walker and Wheaton. However, with regard to claim 1, in a teleconference on August 10, 2005 with the Examiner, the Examiner agreed that neither Walker nor Wheaton teach the use of AC electricity. Wheaton only recites the use of DC electricity (at Col. 5, Lines 59-60). Walker is silent with regard to what type of electricity is employed. Further, even if Walker or Wheaton did teach the use of AC electricity, neither Walker nor Wheaton teach a power hub having an electrical outlet supplying AC electricity to an electrical device.

However, the Examiner requested that claim 1 be amended to include a limitation similar to claim 2 - specifically, that the hub include an input power receptacle receiving AC electricity. Consequently, as per the Examiner's request, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation and claim 2 has been canceled. Support for the power hub receiving AC electricity appears in several places in the specification, including paragraphs 57 and 106.

Additionally, claim 1 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to clarify that the power hub includes an electrical outlet "supplying" AC electricity, not just "for supplying" AC electricity.

Application No. 10/781,183
Attorney Docket No. 14335US02

Consequently, claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be free of the prior art and allowable. Additionally, dependent claims 3-18 depend from claim 1 and are consequently also respectfully submitted to be free of the prior art and allowable.

Independent claim 19 has been amended similarly to claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 20 and to clarify that the hub receives AC electrical power and includes an electrical outlet providing AC electricity to an electrical device. Although claim 19 was rejected in light of Gladsden (in addition to Walker and Wheaton), the Examiner agreed in the teleconference that Gladsden also did not teach an outlet providing AC electricity to an electrical device.

Consequently, claim 19 is respectfully submitted to be free of the prior art and allowable. Additionally, dependent claims 21-33 depend from claim 19 and are consequently also respectfully submitted to be free of the prior art and allowable.

Application No. 10/781,183
Attorney Docket No. 14335US02


CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2005



Joseph M. Barich
Reg. No. 42,291

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100